REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 14 are amended. No new matter is presented. In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 8-10, 11 and 16 are allowable. Applicant gratefully acknowledges the indication of allowable subject matter.

The Examiner objected to claim 17 under 37 C.F.R. Section 1.75(c) for failing to further limit the subject matter. Although claim 1 recites a void portion, it does not specify whether the void portion opens to the same surface or the opposite surface as the heat sink. Claim 17 further limits claim 1 by specifying that the void portion opens to the same surface ("said one of said first and second surfaces") as the heatsink. Accordingly, applicant requests withdrawal of the objection to claim 17.

The Examiner objected to claim 20 as being indefinite due to use of the word "substantially". Applicant respectfully submits that the term "substantially" is often used in conjunction with another term to describe a particular characteristic of the claimed invention and is generally accepted as being definite. *See* M.P.E.P. Section 2173.05 (b). The court held that the limitation "to substantially increase the efficiency of the compound as a copper extractant" was **definite** in view of the general guidelines contained in the specification. *In re Mattison*, 509 F.2d 563, 184 USPQ 484 (CCPA 1975). The court also held that the limitation "which produces substantially equal E and H plane illumination patterns" was **definite** because one of ordinary skill in the art would know what was meant by "substantially equal." *Andrew Corp. v. Gabriel Electronics*, 847 F.2d 819, 6 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Similarly, applicant submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would know what was meant by "overlaps substantially an entirety of said head unit" as claimed in claim 20. Accordingly, applicant requests withdrawal of the objection to claim 20.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 4, 12, 13, 14, 15 and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(e) as being anticipated by Hilton (US Patent No. 6655785). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 1 and 14 are amended to include the allowable features of claims 8 and 10. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

Dependent claims 3, 4, 12, 13, 15 and 17-20 are also patentable by virtue of their dependency from independent claims 1 and 14.

The Examiner rejected claims 2 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being obvious over Hilton in view of Isono (US Patent No. 6604817). The Examiner also rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being obvious over Hilton in view of Teung (US Patent No. 6945638). The Examiner also rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being obvious over Hilton in view of Teung and further in view of Sugiyama (US Patent No. 6339444). Applicant submits that claims 2 and 5-7 are also patentable by virtue of their dependency from independent claim 1, since claim 1 now recites the allowable subject matter of claims 8 and 10.

Based upon the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and its earlier allowance. Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference with Applicant's attorney would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact him at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

for Reg. No. 50,900
Eugene LeDonne, Reg. No. 35, 930
Attorney for Applicant

Reed Smith LLP
599 Lexington Avenue, 29th Floor
New York, NY 10022
Tel. (212) 521-5400

HKA: